Gmose



Docket No.: 217780US90

OBLON
SPIVAK
MCCLELIAND
MAIER
&
NEUSTADT
P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/032,066

Applicants: Osamu HASHIMOTO, et al.

Filing Date: December 31, 2001

For: METHOD OF AND APPARATUS FOR

MANUFACTURING MOLDED MATERIALS OF

THERMOSETTING RESIN COMPOSITION

Group Art Unit: 1732 Examiner: EASHOO, M.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Masayasu Mori

Registration No. 47,301

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone) (703) 413-2220 (fax) H:\21\$\217780\\$HORT_CVR.DOC



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF

OSAMU HASHIMOTO, ET AL. : EXAMINER: EASHOO, M.

SERIAL NO: 10/032,066

FILED: DECEMBER 31, 2001 : GROUP ART UNIT: 1732

FOR: METHOD OF AND APPARATUS FOR MANUFACTURING MOLDED MATERIALS OF THERMOSETTING

RESIN COMPOSITION

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement in the Official Action mailed March 23, 2004, Applicants elect Invention I, Claims 1-7 drawn to a method of granulating thermosetting resins, classified in class 264, subclass 144 for further examination on the merits in the present application.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction requirement for the following reason.

MPEP § 803 states:

... If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct of independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding Restriction requirement on the

Application No. 10/032,066 Reply to Office Action of March 23, 2004 Response to Restriction Requirement

grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a serious burden on the Examiner.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single group be withdrawn, and that full examination on the merits be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Masayasu Mori Attorney of Record Registration No.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Customer Number} \\ 22850 \end{array}$

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 08/03)

MM:jm

I:\USER\MSMOR\Sumitomo BakeLite\217780\217780_Restriction.doc